Ī	Case 5:09-cv-00778-RMW	Document 4	Filed 04/24/09	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4			**	4/2 4/0 Ovb
5			<u>*E-FILED</u>	<u>) - 4/24/09*</u>
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	GILBERTO JUAREZ,)	No. C 09-0778 R	MW (PR)
11	Plaintiff,)	ORDER OF DISI	MISSAL
12	v.)		
13	SANTA CLARA COUNTY, et al.,)		
14	Defendant.)		
15)		
16	This case was anoned when the	Cloubs of Covert w	accivad a complei	nt filed under 10
17	This case was opened when the Clerk of Court received a complaint filed under 42			
18 19	U.S.C. § 1983 from plaintiff. The complaint appears to be a copy of a civil rights complaint			
20	plaintiff filed earlier, <u>Juarez v. Santa Clara County Superior Court Judges</u> , No. C. 08-5404 R ² (PR). That action was dismissed for failure to state a claim on January 30, 2009. In fact, in t			
20	present complaint plaintiff notes that this action is a "rafiling of C 08 5404". Passays the or			

that MW he present complaint, plaintiff notes that this action is a "refiling of C 08-5404." previously considered the claims and allegations in the present complaint in petitioner's earlier case, there is no need for plaintiff to proceed in this duplicate action.

Further, the complaint appears to challenge alleged errors in plaintiff's state postconviction proceedings. The alleged errors are not sufficient to state a cognizable claim for relief in a civil rights action. If plaintiff wished to challenge post-conviction proceedings, then he should have filed a timely notice of appeal for each judgment rather than attempt to litigate such claims in a civil rights action.

Order of Dismissal P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\CR.09\Juarez778dis.wpd

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case 5:09-cv-00778-RMW Document 4 Filed 04/24/09 Page 2 of 2

In order to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, plaintiff must allege two elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. See West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). In addition, in order for a complaint to state a claim arising under federal law, it must be clear from the face of plaintiff's well-pleaded complaint that there is a federal question. See Easton v. Crossland Mortgage Corp., 114 F.3d 979, 982 (9th Cir. 1997). Here, plaintiff's complaint fails state a cognizable claim for relief under § 1983.

Accordingly, the instant action is DISMISSED. The Clerk shall terminate all pending motions, enter judgment and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: __4/24/09 _____

Konald M. Luhyte
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge